

Penalty Focus Board, the Advisory Board of Nature Conservancy, the Western Opera Theatre, and the San Francisco Organizing Project. Walter has distinguished himself as founder and President of San Francisco Renaissance. In addition, he has been an active member of the Advisory Board of the Labor Archives and Research Center and the President's Advisory Board of San Francisco State University. In 1988, Mr. Johnson was chosen to receive the Bay Area Union Labor Party's "1988 Leadership Award" as an appreciation of his exemplary record of achievements.

Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me in commending Walter L. Johnson for his dedication to our nation's working men and women, his exemplarily record of civic achievement, and his determination to better the condition of working people. Walter's service has shown us the meaning of courage, courtesy, compassion and commitment.

H.R. 3479, THE NATIONAL AVIATION CAPACITY ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. JERRY F. COSTELLO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 2002

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3479, the National Aviation Capacity Act. This legislation was introduced by my good friend, Mr. LIPINSKI, and I would like to thank him for his hard work. I am pleased to join him as a cosponsor of this legislation.

O'Hare is a tremendously important airport in not only to Chicago and the Midwest, but also our entire national aviation system. It recently reclaimed the title of the world's busiest airport and is the only airport to serve as a hub for two major airlines. O'Hare serves 190,000 travelers and operates 2,700 flights daily, employs 50,000 people and generates \$37 billion in annual economic activity.

However, O'Hare needs to be redesigned to meet today's demands. It is laid out with seven runways, six of which intersect at least one other runway. The modernization plan would add one new runway. The seven existing runways will be reconfigured to include a southern runway for a total of eight runways, of which six would be parallel. These improvements would have a significant impact on reducing delays and cancellations: bad weather delays would decrease by 95 percent and overall delays would decrease by 79 percent.

On December 5, 2001, Mayor Daley and Governor Ryan reached a historic agreement to expand and improve O'Hare airport. The agreement would modernize O'Hare, create western access to the airport, provide additional funds for soundproofing home and schools near O'Hare, move forward with the construction of a third Chicago airport at the Peotone site and keep Meigs Field open until at least 2006, and likely until 2026.

H.R. 3479 would simply codify the deal so that a future governor does not rescind the agreement. Illinois is in a unique situation because the governor does have veto power. If this legislation is not enacted, it is possible that a future governor could undo all the hard work that the current governor and mayor of Chicago have done to reach this agreement.

There is some concern that this legislation sets a precedent by involving the federal government or creating a short-cut around environmental laws. Again, O'Hare is an exceptional situation which requires this limited federal action. Other cities and airport authorities do not have a governor with veto authority over this issue. The city of Chicago does not want the federal government to take over the modernization of O'Hare but the language is included in case the State delays the State Implementation Plan (SIP) of the Clean Air Act to slow down the project. The language granting priority consideration for a Letter of Intent from the FAA for Peotone is no different than language that can be found in any Transportation Appropriations bill.

Regarding environmental concerns, the bill says that implementation shall be subject to federal laws with respect to environmental protection and analysis, and that the environmental reviews will go forward in an expedited way. There is no attempt to go around existing state or federal environmental laws, and this legislation has the support of many environmental groups.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will allow the much-needed expansion of O'Hare to move forward. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

INTRODUCTION OF BENEFICIAL USE OF DREDGED MATERIAL LEGISLATION

HON. WALTER B. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 2002

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to inform the House of Representatives about the introduction of legislation to allow for the transfer of dredged material onto our Nation's beaches.

In my home state of North Carolina, our beaches are economic engines, providing thousands of jobs and millions of dollars in revenues. However, beach erosion threatens the existence of these economic engines and frankly the federal regulatory and statutory regimes do not move quickly enough to replace this lost infrastructure.

The current standard used by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers requires the disposal of dredged material obtained from a Federal navigation project in the least costly manner. This method almost always results in the offshore placement of sand. However, when these facilities are dredged, the disposal of the dredged material offshore may not be the least cost disposal method. The offshore disposal option increase the costs of erosion so the regional and national economies are damaged by a reduction in recreation spending.

Therefore, I have introduced legislation today making it easier to place sand dredged from authorized navigation projects onto beaches in order to provide shore protection for years to come. My legislation would amend the least cost disposal method to allow municipalities to take these dredged spoils and place them on nearby beaches while adhering to the current 65/35 cost-share ratio.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues to join me today in cosponsoring this legislation. Four times more Americans visit the Nation's

beaches than our National Parks every year. Beach nourishment is good economic policy and this proposal will allow the Army Corps of Engineers to supplement its effective shore protection programs.

TRANSPORTATION OF NUCLEAR WASTE HAS IMPRESSIVE SAFETY RECORD

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 2002

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member commends to his colleagues the following editorial from the July 15, 2002, Omaha World-Herald. The editorial offers insightful comments on the issue of transporting nuclear waste and highlights the impressive safety record of shipments which have been made over the years. For instance, 3,000 shipments of high-level nuclear waste have been safely completed over the past three decades. The containers for the waste have been subjected to numerous tests to ensure their strength and durability even in the most extreme circumstances.

Unfortunately, many opponents of the Yucca Mountain site have tried to use emotional scare tactics about the transportation of nuclear waste in hopes of derailing the entire project. However, as the editorial makes clear, central depository would greatly enhance safety.

[From the Omaha World-Herald, July 15, 2002]

HOW SAFE IS IT?

Now that the Senate has voted to allow the construction of a national high-level nuclear waste storage facility at Yucca Mountain, Department of Energy officials will have to confront a key issue: Transportation.

Officials expect up to 77,000 tons of dangerous radioactive material such as spent nuclear plant fuel rods to be transported to the remote Nevada desert for indefinite storage. That waste will come from all 39 states, encompassing 131 sites, that currently store the material in mostly above-ground facilities. The sites include not only nuclear power plants but also military weapons facilities and research institutions.

The waste will travel by truck and rail. It will have to pass through some of the nation's most populous areas. Some will come through the Midlands, on its Interstate highways and its many rail lines. The government has projected that as many as 100 truck or rail accidents might occur over the 25-year life of the project.

The question of safety is key.

Opponents of the project tried to attack transport of the waste before the Senate decision because methods and routes had not yet been specified. But they were premature. It's only now, as DOE applies for a license for the facility from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, that such issues can be addressed.

Many critics of Yucca Mountain, by the way, aren't necessarily being open about their motives. Some may honestly believe approval of the site is potentially dangerous. Others, however, are simply anti-nuclear. They realize that without a disposal site, nuclear power in this country will likely die—"choking on its own waste," as one senator put it.

When critics raise their objections, they will have to overcome this fact: In the past